



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,430	01/28/2004	Brian L. Gibson	H0003690	3601

7590 08/11/2009
Scott Jacobson, Esquire
Honeywell International, Inc.
101 Columbia Road
P.O. Box 2245
Morristown, NJ 07962-2245

EXAMINER

CHEUNG, WILLIAM K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1796

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/11/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

1 RECORD OF ORAL HEARING

2
3 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

4
5
6 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
7 AND INTERFERENCES

8
9
10 Ex parte BRIAN L. GIBSON
11 and FRED DURRENBERGER

12
13
14 Appeal 2009-002988
15 Application 10/766,430
16 Technology Center 1700

17
18
19 Oral Hearing Held: June 23, 2009
20

21
22
23 Before CHARLES F. WARREN, CATHERINE Q. TIMM, and
24 JEFFREY T. SMITH, Administrative Patent Judges

25
26 ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANTS:

27
28 JOSEPH POSILLICO, ESQUIRE
29 Fox Rothschild
30 1101 Market Street
31 Suite 2600
32 Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
33

34
35 ALSO PRESENT:

36
37 JIMMIE JOHNSON, Fox Rothschild
38 CARRIE BEATUS, Honeywell
39
40

1 The above-entitled matter came on for hearing on Tuesday,
2 June 23, 2009, at 10:10 a.m. at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, 600
3 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, before Leanne M. Krivonak, Notary
4 Number 180129, Notary Public.

5 THE CLERK: Calendar Number 52, Appeal Number
6 2009-002988. Mr. Posillico.

7 JUDGE WARREN: All right. Mr. Posillico.

8 MR. POSILLICO: Good morning.

9 JUDGE WARREN: I believe, I'm sorry.

10 Would you please introduce your guests, sir.

11 MR. POSILLICO: Yes, good morning. Thank you.

12 What I would like to do is start out --

13 JUDGE WARREN: Sir, could you introduce your guests?

14 MR. POSILLICO: Oh, yes, I'm sorry.

15 I have with me Mr. Jimmie Johnson, also from Fox Rothschild
16 and Ms. Carrie Beatus from Honeywell.

17 JUDGE WARREN: Good morning.

18 As you know, sir, you have 20 minutes. You may start when
19 ready.

20 MR. POSILLICO: Yes. May I proceed?

21 JUDGE WARREN: Please.

22 MR. POSILLICO: First, I would like to thank the Board for
23 their time; second, we are going to rely primarily on the briefs and so I
24 would like to try touch on the most important that I can elucidate a little bit
25 that are in the brief, but I can expand on.

1 What I would like to start on with is identify what we're not
2 claiming in this case. This case is one in which we are not claiming
3 compounds and we're not claiming compositions. And one of the reasons I
4 want to point that out is because I think it helps to highlight what some of
5 the flaws are in the Examiner's rejections.

6 In some ways the Examiner's rejections are looking at the
7 claims as if they were -- we were trying to claim the compounds that are
8 identified in the claim, but we are not. What we are claiming is a process, an
9 extrusion process that has two steps in it. One is to provide a specific
10 extrudable composition that compromises an extrudable resin, plus a
11 compound or a collection of compounds, a mixture of compounds having a
12 specific structure.

13 That specific structure is required that at least 50 percent of the
14 compounds that are used have an octa- substituted carboxylic acid ester
15 structure.

16 The Examiner has cited the Kaynaco reference as anticipating
17 the claim. The problem with the rejection is that the Kaynaco references
18 never mentions any particular type of sucrose ester. I should say it actually
19 mentions two types specifically. It mentions monosubstituted esters and dye
20 substituted esters. And other than that it's just simply generically indicates
21 the use of sucrose alkyl esters.

22 I think one of the problems -- so on its face there is no explicit
23 description of a compound having a structure that is required by our claim.

24 Again, that structure requires that there is a carboxylic acid
25 ester at each of the eight possible substitution sites on the sucrose.

1 The Examiner has taken the position that that never -- that that
2 reference never left anticipates the claim and the -- I gather the Examiner's
3 position is that that the compound that we're specifically requiring is
4 somehow inherent in the disclosure. And I think the Examiner's position is
5 that that flows because there is only a small number of species within the
6 generic term of sucrose alkyl ester and here is where there is, I think, a
7 substantial disagreement.

8 In our Brief we identified that there are eight subgeneric classes
9 of compounds within the term sucrose alkyl ester.

10 The Examiner had taken the position that there are eight
11 species, I gather, or eight compounds. So from a factual standpoint, a
12 technical standpoint, there is a very large disagreement.

13 Within the designation of sucrose alkyl ester there are literally
14 thousands and thousands, almost an incalculable number of compounds that
15 fall within that group.

16 By way of example, there are at least eight mono substituted
17 esters, depending upon the position of the ester, and you can multiply that
18 out almost geometrically.

19 So the Examiner has taken the position that there is only three
20 species which I think the position is wrong and in fact there are thousands.

21 The Examiner has also missed the fact, I think, that we are
22 specifically claiming a carboxylic acid ester. There are two of those types of
23 esters mentioned in Kaynaco, but the generic disclosure is not limited to
24 that. Within the description of a sucrose alkyl ester you can have a
25 phosphate ester which then multiplies the number of potential compounds by
26 even more thousands.

1 So for the Examiner to take the position that Kaynaco
2 inherently discloses the compound that we require to be present in at least 50
3 percent of those molecules is just factually wrong.

4 Now the Examiner has cited this website for the proposition
5 and it's actually not very clear why the Examiner has cited that website and,
6 in fact, whether the citation of that website is proper in an anticipation
7 rejection.

8 Anticipation should find all of the claimed subject matter in a
9 single reference, but in this case the Examiner is bringing in another
10 reference which, by my understanding of the law would be proper to explain
11 how a person skilled in the art would understand that that reference should
12 be read. But I don't see that being the case here with this page from the
13 website.

14 What the Examiner has said is that the page from the
15 website -- he's citing that page from the website for the proposition that the
16 sucrose alkyl ester that's disclosed in Kaynaco is identical to what we're
17 claiming and so that to me is different than to simply saying this is how a
18 person skilled in the art would understand a reference. He is bringing in
19 another reference which, by my understanding the case law is improper
20 under an anticipation of rejection.

21 JUDGE WARREN: You can in an anticipation rejection can,
22 of course, bring in a reference to explain a fact and the reference relied upon,
23 I believe.

24 Correct?

25 MR. POSILLICO: I'm sorry. I'm --

1 JUDGE WARREN: In an anticipation rejection you can bring
2 in a reference to show how one of ordinary-skilled in the art would interpret
3 the reference relied on.

4 MR. POSILLICO: That's correct.

5 JUDGE WARREN: And you're saying that doesn't happen
6 here?

7 MR. POSILLICO: That doesn't really happen here.

8 In fact, it's -- do you have another question?

9 JUDGE WARREN: So the product literature that the Examiner
10 cites does not refer to a trade name in the patent -- in the Kaynaco patent?

11 MR. POSILLICO: Not that I'm aware of.

12 It doesn't -- there is no -- there is nothing that the Examiner has
13 cited to or that I'm aware of that would link specifically the term sucrose
14 alkyl ester to this website page indicating that that term means this
15 compound.

16 In fact, --

17 JUDGE WARREN: Well, is he using it just to give an example
18 of a structure?

19 MR. POSILLICO: Well, what the Examiner says in his
20 rejection and his Answer is he's using it to show that the sucrose alkyl ester
21 of Kaynaco, and that's the Examiner's words, is identical to the compound
22 that we're claiming.

23 So to me -- so, I have two points on that. Number one, I think
24 that's legally improper because that is not, as you said, Your Honor, using
25 the second item simply to explain how a person skilled in the art would
26 understand it, he's trying to use it to show some kind of identity of structure.

1 But the second problem is --

2 JUDGE WARREN: Well, if you're correct, Counselor, that the
3 sucrose alkyl esters of the reference include the compounds such as those
4 described within a website article here, why would there be a problem of the
5 Examiner using the website article to give a demonstration of the structure
6 of the sucrose monoester?

7 MR. POSILLICO: Well, if there was an issue about what the
8 structure would be, that perhaps would be the case, but he's not using it as an
9 example. He's using that website to take the position that what is disclosed
10 in Kaynaco is identical to what we're claiming and so it's not explaining the
11 term.

12 We acknowledge that the term, sucrose alkyl ester, includes a
13 huge number of compounds, including within that broad genus the
14 compound that we've selected to be present in at least 50 percent. But the
15 case law is very clear, a simple mentioning of a genus is not a disclosure of
16 every single species in the genus.

17 So what I think the Examiner has done is he using this citation
18 to the website to kind of get around that problem. Actually his citation of
19 that document actually supports our position and it doesn't help his. And
20 that's because the structure that's shown in that document is not a structure
21 within the structure of our claims.

22 There are two things that are important about -- again, if you
23 were to assume that it's relevant for any purpose and we want to look at its
24 teaching, that structure shown in the website has one location substituted
25 with stearic acid ester, but then there are two other locations which appear to

1 be substituted with methoxy groups and our structure would not permit, does
2 not encompass that kind of a structure.

3 So the Examiner is saying that this is so inherent all I would
4 have to do is go to this website to show the identical structure, but he's
5 actually proving our point and that is it's not inherent, the term sucrose alkyl
6 ester is so broad to encompass thousands of compounds, even ones that are
7 not within the scope of our claims.

8 The other point is that same document has a statement in there
9 which indicates and I can read it for you, but it indicates that they
10 provide -- sugar esters as they refer to them -- with HLB values from 1 to 16
11 and then it provides a chart.

12 And if you look at that chart, there is no sugar ester as recited
13 on that website that has anything more than 10 percent octa ester in it. The
14 one that has the most concentration of octa ester is the one that is identified
15 next to the HLB value of 1 and the percentage of octa ester is barely visible
16 all the way to the right of the chart which is between the 90 and the 100
17 which indicates that it's less than 10 percent of octa ester.

18 So there's -- and the amount of octa ester goes down from there.
19 So according to this -- the website that the Examiner has cited every single
20 compound or combination of compounds that are described in this website
21 would not meet our claims. And again, there is an infinite number of those
22 because these are just -- they're bracketing of the range.

23 So as you go from 1 to 3 to 7 to 11 to 16, all of those have 10
24 percent or less of octa ester compounds; whereas, in contrast our claims
25 require at least 50 percent of octa ester substituted carbocyclic acid
26 compounds and the reason that claim says that is because we have

1 discovered that there are unexpected results with respect to the performance
2 in this process on the extruded product and extrusion process when you use
3 compounds or combination of compounds where you have that minimum
4 amount of the octa substituted carboxylic acid esters.

5 One other point I would make, too, is our claim requires that
6 the carbocyclic acid esters have from eight -- in a broad claim eight to 40
7 carbon atoms and then there are some narrower claims where we say 12 to
8 26.

9 The Examiner has again said that anticipated because there is a
10 mention of fatty acid. Again, it's the similar kind of problem. Fatty acid is a
11 very general term, a broad term, which by my understanding of the term can
12 have as little as all four, five or six carbons or -- perhaps at least on the low
13 side is outside the scope of that range. And that brings in again another
14 whole variability to what would be required here for Kaynaco to be an
15 anticipatory reference.

16 This disclosure is simply generic and there's thousands of
17 potential compounds or species within that -- And therefore, the anticipation
18 of rejection can't stand and once we establish that, we have strong evidence
19 of non obviousness because of the unexpected results.

20 And that's what I would like to emphasize. If there are any
21 other questions, I would be happy to try to answer them.

22 JUDGE WARREN: No further questions.

23 MR. POSILLICO: Thank you.

24 JUDGE WARREN: Thank you very much.

25 Whereupon, at approximately 10:25 a.m., the proceedings were
26 concluded.